

# Appendices

## 1a. 2008 Comprehensive Plan Survey

City of Muskego - 2020 Comprehensive Plan Survey						
<p>Please have the survey completed and sent in by September 21st, 2008 OR feel free to complete the survey online at <a href="http://webapps.ci.muskego.wi.us/2020Survey">http://webapps.ci.muskego.wi.us/2020Survey</a></p>						
YOUR INFORMATION						
NAME(S): _____		ADDRESS: _____				
1. PRESENT/FUTURE DEVELOPMENT						
<p>One of the main discussion topics the 2020 Comprehensive Planning Committee is having is in regards to preserving the City's urban to rural character for decades to come. The definition of rural character, in this sense, being those larger lots, agricultural, and open spaces that are predominantly found in the southern areas of Muskego. One of the ideas to ensure that this rural character is preserved into the future is to make any future land division meet cluster development techniques. By doing this, a landowner would still be allowed to get the same density (amount of lots) they are entitled to now, but they would have to cluster development into smaller lots and then divide the remaining land so a majority is preserved as agricultural workable lands or conservation lands. Thus, large open tracts of land would still be found in the community years from now. Currently, zoning codes allow much of the City's rural lands to divide at a rate of 1 lot per 2.75 acres by right. In light of this information, please answer the following statements:</p>						
		Agree	Neutral	Disagree	No Opinion	
1.1	The City should try and maintain the amount of workable farmland currently found in the community.	3	2	1	0	
1.2	A 2.75 acre parcel is considered rural character.	3	2	1	0	
1.3	Zoning for our agricultural and rural areas should continue to allow a 2.75 acre lot by right.	3	2	1	0	
1.3a	If you disagree with the above statement, what minimum lot size do you think should be encouraged (5, 10, 20 acre or other)? _____					
1.4	As long as an existing landowner is entitled to the same density (amount of lots) they are today, the City should make cluster developments mandatory in order to assure that larger lots and rural open spaces will be found in the decades to come.	3	2	1	0	
<p>Currently, over half of the City's total parcels of land are a 1/2 acre or less. Many of which are used for single-family residential uses. Further, there are only a handful of parcels left in the City that will allow a higher density single family development by right (1/2 acre parcels or less). In light of this information, please answer the following statements:</p>						
		Agree	Neutral	Disagree	No Opinion	
1.5	The City should allow <u>new</u> areas for denser single family conventional development in the 2020 Land Use Plan (denser single family development in this case meaning allowing lots of a 1/2 acre size or smaller)?	3	2	1	0	
1.6	Other opinions on development? What should the City be doing more or less of in regards to promoting/controlling future development? _____ _____					
2. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT						
<p>The City currently has many individuals working on the state of economic development in the City, including the Community Development Authority and the Mayor's Task Force. Please answer the statements/questions below in regards to where the City should direct their continued economic development efforts.</p>						
2.1	Please rank where you believe the City should focus Economic Development efforts in the next 10 years (circle number shown with 1 being highest priority)					
	Moorland Corridor	1	2	3	4	5
	Janesville Road (Downtown: Pioneer to Bay Lane Drive)	1	2	3	4	5
	Janesville Road (Downtown: Racine Avenue Area)	1	2	3	4	5
	Janesville Road (Tess Corners Area)	1	2	3	4	5
	Racine Avenue/I-43 Gateway	1	2	3	4	5
	Industrial Parks	1	2	3	4	5
	Other _____	1	2	3	4	5
2.2	What types of businesses would you like to see in Muskego (Apparel, restaurants, etc. OR actual names of businesses)? _____ _____					
2.3	What is the most important issue facing economic development in Muskego? _____ _____					
2.4	Other opinions on economic development? What should the City be doing more or less of in regards to economic development? _____ _____					



## 1b. 2008 Comprehensive Plan Survey Summary

### **Introduction**

The City of Muskego 2020 Comprehensive Plan Survey was orchestrated and designed by the City's appointed Comprehensive Planning Committee in August 2008. The 2008 survey was the second survey completed solely for the formulation of recommendations for the 2020 Comprehensive Plan. The first survey was completed in 2005, tackled a broader spectrum of issues, and was sent to a random sample of 1500 property owners. The 2008 survey was tailored by the Comprehensive Planning Committee to gather information specific to the main issues that the Committee believed was going to affect the community in the next decade. The survey was sent to all property owners in the community in order to attain as many points of view as possible.

The survey was conducted by a mailing to all possible property addresses in the City in August 2008. The mailing included owners and tenants alike. Further, the survey was publicized in the City's newspapers and an on-line version of the survey was posted on the City's website for further convenience. Five dinner gift certificates, from Muskego restaurants, were awarded at random to the respondents filling out the survey. After factoring out duplicate addresses, multiple owned properties, and various commercial/industrial properties, it was approximated that a total of 8,439 surveys could have been returned. A total of 983 surveys were received, which results in a 12% return. It was determined that seven hundred nine (709) or 72% were submitted via mail and two hundred seventy-four (274) or 28% were submitted via the Internet. The amount of data received from the residents is substantial as the 983 surveys are 472 more than received in the 2005 survey. Further, as the results indicate below, almost all participants provided a wealth of written data for the City to observe what types of opinions are within the community.

### **Present/Future Development**

The first section of the survey directed questions relating to how the public perceived future development patterns taking place in the community in relation to preservation of open spaces and farmland. Further, questioning concerned the public's perception on how 'rural character' is defined and if people agree with promoting different mechanisms to promote preserving the rural character of Muskego.

Overall, the responses showed that a majority (67%) of individuals believed that the City should do all they can to preserve the amount of workable farmland and rural open spaces as possible. Many (56%) thought that the existing zoning of allowing 2.75-acre parcels by right in the rural portions of Muskego should continue to be allowed. However, even though the 2.75-acre designation was favored, an overwhelming majority (64%) believed that the City should make mechanisms, such as cluster developments, mandatory when individuals look to subdivide their lots, in order to preserve larger tracts of open lands and open space. Lastly, a majority (64%) believed that the City should not look to promote new areas that allow high-density residential lots (1/2 acre or smaller).

The set of questions began with the following synopsis:

*One of the main discussion topics the 2020 Comprehensive Planning Committee is having is in regards to preserving the City's urban to rural character for decades to come. The definition of rural character, in this sense, being those larger lots, agricultural, and open spaces that are predominantly found in the southern areas of Muskego. One of the ideas to ensure that this rural character is preserved into the future is to make any future land division meet cluster development techniques. By doing this, a landowner would still be allowed to get the same density (amount of lots) they are entitled to now, but they would have to cluster development into smaller lots and then divide the remaining land so a majority is preserved as agricultural workable lands or conservation lands. Thus, large open tracts of land would still be found in the community years from now. Currently, zoning codes allow much of the City's rural*

---

## Appendix

*lands to divide at a rate of 1 lot per 2.75 acres by right. In light of this information, please answer the following statements:*

The questions asked along with their response rates were as followed:

**1.1 The City should try and maintain the amount of workable farmland currently found in the community.**

Responses: Agree 67% (654/983) Neutral 17% (168/983)  
Disagree 13% (131/983) No Opinion 3% (30/983)  
Average Response = 2.47  
Highest Response = Agree (654 – 67%)

**1.2 A 2.75-acre parcel is considered rural character.**

Responses: Agree 56% (550/983) Neutral 16% (160/983)  
Disagree 20% (195/983) No Opinion 8% (78/983)  
Average Response = 2.20  
Highest Response = Agree (550 – 56%)

**1.3 Zoning for our agricultural and rural areas should continue to allow a 2.75-acre lot by right.**

Responses: Agree 54% (534/983) Neutral 13% (126/983)  
Disagree 22% (216/983) No Opinion 11% (107/983)  
Average Response = 2.11  
Highest Response = Agree (534 – 54%)

**1.3a If you disagree with the above statement, what minimum lot size do you think should be encouraged (5, 10, 20 acre or other)?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B. Majority of the responses are broken down below:

Responses: ½ acre 2% (5/245) 1 acre 6% (15/245)  
5 acres 44% (108/245) 5 to 10 acres 4% (10/245)  
10 acres 16% (38/245) 20 acres 9% (21/245)  
50 acres 1% (2/245)  
Highest Response = 5 acre 44% (108 – 44%)

**1.4 As long as an existing landowner is entitled to the same density (amount of lots) they are today, the City should make cluster developments mandatory in order to assure that larger lots and rural open spaces will be found in the decades to come.**

Responses: Agree 64% (632/983) Neutral 12% (119/983)  
Disagree 16% (161/983) No Opinion 7% (71/983)  
Average Response = 2.33  
Highest Response = Agree (632 – 64%)

**1.5 The City should allow new areas for denser single-family conventional development in the 2020 Land Use Plan (denser single family development in this case meaning allowing lots of a 1/2 acre size or smaller)?**

Responses: Agree 23% (224/983) Neutral 10% (98/983)  
Disagree 64% (625/983) No Opinion 4% (36/983)  
Average Response = 1.52  
Highest Response = Disagree (625 – 64%)

**1.6 Other opinions on development? What should the City be doing more or less of in regards to promoting/controlling future development?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

## **Economic Development**

The second section of the survey related to the future of economic development and where the City should be concentrating these efforts. The 2020 Planning Committee requested questions directly related to economic development efforts in order to best gauge where recommendations should fall in the next decade. The City's Community Development Authority and Mayor's Task Force on Economic Development primarily serve the City's economic development functions. Questions also considered what types of businesses residents desired in the community and what are the most important issues surrounding economic development in the City.

While responses varied, the Moorland Corridor and Janesville Road received the most attention to where the residents felt economic development efforts should be concentrated upon. Aiding the industrial parks received considerable favoritism as well.

The types of businesses people desired also varied, but the opinions indicated that a huge majority wanted to see more chain restaurants (not fast food) in the community. Further, a need for an alternative higher end grocery store was evident. The opinions suggested that a chain home improvement store was also appealing.

Lastly, a large amount of responses were found in regards to questions 2.3 and 2.4 (most important issue facing economic development and other opinions on economic development). The re-occurring answers are found below, however, it should be noted that making something happen with the former Parkland Mall property was an overwhelming response:

- Need development vision
- Taxes/rents too high
- Maintaining urban to rural mix
- Infrastructure planning
- Bringing more business into City
- Increase tax base
- Creating identity solely for Muskego
- Creating a downtown
- Water supply
- Developing Parkland Mall
- Being "business friendly"
- Traffic concerns on main roads
- Rebuilding Janesville Road
- No good restaurants
- Balancing commercial/residential tax base
- Need more business development
- More industry
- Increase architecture awareness
- Keep existing properties clean
- Create demographic attractive to retailers
- Need public transportation
- Controlling growth
- Promote business park
- Add more skilled jobs to community
- Preserve small town feeling
- Make the City more inviting
- Decorate for the seasons
- Need industry on Moorland
- Market community, Moorland Road, Janesville Road, Industrial Parks
- Bring lakes back to community
- Less apartments and condominiums
- Bring in business and light manufacturing
- Need cultural and sporting activities
- Add aesthetic signage of City facilities
- Slow down single-family residential homebuilding
- Offer incentives to businesses for locating in Muskego
- Be cognizant of green space when developing
- Update older business structures
- Provide significant budget for City economic development activities
- Keep roads maintained first
- Need to create destination
- Utilize/encourage green development

---

## Appendix

The economic development set of questions began with the following synopsis:

The City currently has many individuals working on the state of economic development in the City, including the Community Development Authority and the Mayor's Task Force. Please answer the statements/questions below in regards to where the City should direct their continued economic development efforts.

The questions asked along with their response rates were as followed:

### 2.1 Please rank where you believe the City should focus Economic Development efforts in the next 10 years (circle number shown with 1 being highest priority)

#### Moorland Corridor

Responses: 1's 42% (414/983) 2's 17% (170/983) 3's 14% (135/983)  
4's 8% (86/983) 5's 18% (178/983)

Average Response = 2.43

Highest Response = 1 (414 – 42%)

#### **Janesville Road (Downtown: Pioneer to Bay Lane Drive)**

Responses: 1's 49% (480/983) 2's 19% (189/983) 3's 10% (97/983)  
4's 7% (66/983) 5's 15% (151/983)

Average Response = 2.21

Highest Response = 1 (480 – 49%)

#### **Janesville Road (Downtown: Racine Avenue Area)**

Responses: 1's 22% (220/983) 2's 21% (206/983) 3's 23% (223/983)  
4's 12% (116/983) 5's 22% (218/983)

Average Response = 2.90

Highest Response = 3 (223 – 23%)

#### **Janesville Road (Tess Corners Area)**

Responses: 1's 10% (100/983) 2's 13% (124/983) 3's 21% (211/983)  
4's 18% (180/983) 5's 37% (368/983)

Average Response = 3.60

Highest Response = 5 (368 – 37%)

#### **Racine Avenue/I-43 Gateway**

Responses: 1's 16% (159/983) 2's 16% (162/983) 3's 19% (183/983)  
4's 15% (148/983) 5's 34% (331/983)

Average Response = 3.34

Highest Response = 5 (331 – 34%)

#### **Industrial Parks**

Responses: 1's 28% (279/983) 2's 17% (168/983) 3's 18% (178/983)  
4's 9% (87/983) 5's 28% (271/983)

Average Response = 2.90

Highest Response = 1 (279 – 28%) & 5 (271 – 28%)

#### **Other**

Verbatim responses, with the stated rankings, in Appendix B.

- 2.2 What types of businesses would you like to see in Muskego (Apparel, restaurants, etc. OR actual names of businesses)?**  
Verbatim responses in Appendix B.
- 2.3 What is the most important issue facing economic development in Muskego?**  
Verbatim responses in Appendix B.
- 2.4 Other opinions on economic development? What should the City be doing more or less of in regards to economic development?**  
Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

## **Housing**

The housing section of the survey concentrated on what people thought in regards to encouraging more apartment, condominium, and senior housing development in the community in the next decade. Basically, should the community be making new land opportunities available for these types of multi-family development.

Overall, the responses showed that a majority of individuals (64%) believed that the City should not encourage new apartment living developments. A mix of opinions was found in relation to allowing new condominium developments (Agree-29%, Neutral-30%, Disagree-34%, No Opinion-7%), however again, the highest response (34%) felt that promoting new areas for condos was not in the City's best interest. One area that the citizens did highly agree to was promoting new areas for senior housing (39%).

A question was asked in relation to where people might want to see new apartment, condominium, or senior housing developments in the City. The verbatim responses can be found in Appendix B and the re-occurring responses are found below. However, it should be noted that the majority of the responses were to place these types of uses next to where existing services are located. Thus, the downtown and along the City's major arterial roads was discussed to be the primary location for future placing of these multi-family uses due to the existing businesses present (grocery, banking, pharmacy, clinics, etc.).

### General

- Keep all away from single-family housing
- Diversified throughout City
- Near downtown, next to services
- Ensure any is constructed at a high end
- Racine/43 gateway
- Near Hwy 36, southeast corner of City
- Along Racine Avenue
- Tess Corners
- Where existing multi-family housing exists
- Parkland Mall property
- Moorland Road-Moorland corridor
- Around Big Muskego Lake
- Janesville Road east of Salentine Auto
- Only look to attract full-time residents (senior or condos, not apartment living)
- Not in established residential areas/subdivisions
- College Avenue
- Along with clustered planned developments

### Apartments

---

## Appendix

- Multi-family should be next to main thoroughfares, not through residential areas
- Multi-family close to schools
- Above businesses

### Condominiums

- Condos/senior housing close to grocery or medical facilities
- Near schools/parks
- Little Muskego lakefront
- Above businesses

### Senior Housing

- Condos/senior housing close to grocery or medical facilities
- Near Janesville/Downtown
- Anywhere in City due to small impact, but should be a planned development like Regency
- Near schools/parks
- Close to rescue services

Lastly, a question was asked in regards to the public's general thoughts on housing in Muskego and what the City should be doing more or less of in regards to housing. The verbatim responses can be found in Appendix B and the more re-occurring responses are found below.

- When approving single-family developments, keep to high standards like those in Belle Chasse, Candlewood, etc.
- No new apartment developments anywhere
- Keep in mind school space when approving future housing
- Keep open space in mind when approving future housing
- Keep infrastructure in mind when approving future housing
- Promote business, not housing, due to impacts on budget with new housing
- Cut back on housing as a whole
- Zoning on upkeep of existing housing should be enforced
- More walk ability (paths) and alternative transportation (bike/battery operated vehicles paths) should be approved with new/existing housing
- Disagreement with any new multi-family uses, stick to single-family
- Housing that demonstrates less strain on services
- More affordable single-family homes
- Increase architectural requirements for all new housing
- Larger lots, keep rural feel, less-density
- Limit residential housing, possible moratorium on housing
- Encourage ownership types of housing (single-family, condos, etc.)
- Build efficient houses, built to last
- More low/moderate income housing

The set of questions began with the following synopsis:

The City currently has multi-family, condominium, and senior housing developments along the more urban areas in the northern parts of Muskego. Please answer the following statements to aid the Comprehensive Planning Committee in determining where Muskego should progress in relation to these uses in the next decade.

The questions asked along with their response rates were as followed:

**3.1 The City should promote new areas for multi-family development.**

Responses: Agree 13% (126/983) Neutral 16% (161/983)  
Disagree 64% (625/983) No Opinion 7% (71/983)  
Average Response = 2.09  
Highest Response = Disagree (625 – 64%)

**3.2 The City should promote new areas for condominium development.**

Responses: Agree 29% (283/983) Neutral 30% (297/983)  
Disagree 34% (335/983) No Opinion 7% (68/983)  
Average Response = 2.80  
Highest Response = Disagree (335 – 34%)

**3.3 The City should promote new areas for apartment development.**

Responses: Agree 8% (82/983) Neutral 18% (179/983)  
Disagree 65% (642/983) No Opinion 8% (80/983)  
Average Response = 1.97  
Highest Response = Disagree (642 – 65%)

**3.4 The City should promote new areas for senior housing.**

Responses: Agree 39% (379/983) Neutral 35% (346/983)  
Disagree 19% (182/983) No Opinion 8% (76/983)  
Average Response = 3.17  
Highest Response = Agree (379 – 39%)

**3.5 If you agree to any of the statements above, any ideas on where that type of housing should be located?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

**3.6 Other opinions on housing? What should the City be doing more or less of in regards to housing?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

**Transportation**

Transportation is a major smart growth element of the new 2020 Comprehensive Plan and the 2020 Committee requested aid from the citizens, via the survey, in order to determine the perceived problem transportation areas in Muskego. Further, the survey directed questioning as to the public's thoughts on the interconnection and promotion of recreation trails.

The survey returned that a majority (65%) of respondents desired that the City continue to interconnect corridors of bike and pedestrian paths throughout Muskego. Only a small portion of individuals disagreed (9%) with this question. Of those agreeing to interconnect path corridors, the most predominant responses stressed by respondents to construct sooner rather than later are found below (Find verbatim responses to this in appendix B).

- Durham Drive from McShane south
- Janesville Road from Racine Avenue east
- Along Janesville Road from County Park to Big Bend
- All along Janesville Road
- Around Big Muskego Lake
- Racine Avenue from Janesville Road north to I-43

---

## Appendix

- Racine Avenue from Janesville Road south to High School
- Racine Avenue from High School south to County border
- North Cape Road
- Field Drive
- Bay Lane Drive
- Connecting schools to neighborhoods
- Connect Denoon Middle School to Muskego High School
- Crowbar Road from Racine County line to Janesville (bike lane)
- All along Woods Road
- Around lakes in general
- Tess Corners Road from College to Woods
- Muskego Dam Drive
- Path connecting Candlewood/Quietwood subdivisions to Moorland Park/Moorland Road
- McShane Drive
- Lannon Drive
- Martin Drive
- Country Brook estates to Meadow Green West Subdivision

The questionnaire referred an inquiry to the community on perceived problem transportation areas within the City as well. The 2020 Committee is looking to formulate specific recommendations that might involve capital projects and knowing where vital traffic infrastructure improvements may be required was critical. The most common responses that were found are discussed herein (Find verbatim responses to this in appendix B).

### Roads

- Upgrade Durham Road
- Sidewalk or bike path along Racine Avenue and Janesville Road
- Re-open Durham at Janesville Road
- Difficult leaving Muskego Elementary on Janesville Road
- Trails on roads around High School – To get Cross Country runners safe

### Intersections

- Signals at Janesville/Martin
- Signals at Janesville/Parkland
- Hwy 36/'OO' intersection needs turn arrows on signals
- Intersection upgrade Lannon/Janesville
- Intersection upgrade to Woods /Janesville
- Intersection upgrade to Racine /College
- Intersection upgrade to Field Drive / Hillendale Drive
- Intersection upgrade Racine /Saturn
- Intersection upgrade to Kelsey /Racine
- Signals at Woods/Moorland
- Intersection upgrade to Pioneer /Janesville
- Intersection upgrade to Tans /Racine

### Enforcement

- Crowbar Road in front of Lake Denoon Middle School speed enforcement
- Hi-View Drive speed enforcement due to people crossing from Durham to North Cape
- Hwy 36 and Muskego Dam Road speed enforcement
- Woods Road speed enforcement
- Ryan Road speed enforcement

- Mystic Drive speed enforcement
- Speed limit reduction on Janesville Road west of Muskego Industrial Park

## General

- No roundabouts
- Encourage roundabouts

Lastly, a question was asked in regards to the public's general thoughts on transportation in Muskego and what the City should be doing more or less of in regards to transportation. The verbatim responses can be found in Appendix B and the more re-occurring responses are found below.

- Improve Durham Drive
- No roundabouts
- Encourage roundabouts
- Include bike lanes when updating roads
- More recreation paths
- No money towards public transportation
- Add alternative/public transportation
- Keep adding trails
- Maintain road surfaces
- Larger park and ride at Racine Avenue
- Plow bike paths in winter
- Keep supporting senior taxi
- Update Janesville Road

The set of transportation questions began with the following synopsis:

The City is progressing in making trail corridor connections in many locations throughout the City. Further, problem transportation areas (intersections, degrading roadways, etc.) have become a popular issue over the past years. Please answer the following statements in relation to these areas of concern.

The questions asked along with their response rates were as followed:

**4.1 The City should look to interconnect corridors of bike and pedestrian paths in the City.**

Responses: Agree 65% (635/983) Neutral 17% (169/983)  
Disagree 9% (86/983) No Opinion 9% (93/983)

Average Response = 3.67

Highest Response = Agree (635 – 65%)

**4.2 Is there an area in the City that could use a bike/pedestrian path connection or corridor?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

**4.3 Are there specific "problem" roads or intersections you see in Muskego? If so, where and what do you believe are the issues?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

**4.4 Other opinions on transportation? What should the City be doing more or less of in regards to transportation?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

## **Parks, Recreation, & Conservation**

The fifth section of the survey related to the current and future status of the City's Parks, Recreation, and Conservation facilities and lands. Planning for the year 2020 largely depends on what types of recreational options are available for the City's residents and which facilities/lands are attainable for the majority of the population. The first question inquired if current park facilities and lands were sufficient in the respondent's minds. The majority of the respondents agreed (49%) with this statement with only a small portion disagreeing (18%).

The second question asked if there is areas in the City that people felt were underserved by parks. Further, if the respondent believed there were underserved areas, where those areas might be and what facilities may be needed. Only 15% of the people felt that there were areas underserved by parks. Of those 15%, the following re-occurring responses were mentioned (Verbatim responses are found in Appendix B).

- Southeast corner of Muskego
- East side of Muskego
- Parks and access enhancements to Big Muskego Lake
- Lighted softball/hardball diamonds
- Need sledding hill
- More recreational fields in general (softball, baseball, football, soccer, etc.)
- More paved biking trails (College and Martin)
- Dog park
- Community outdoor pool
- More facilities at Moorland Park
- Park near Martin/Janesville area
- Develop Park Arthur
- More basketball hoops at parks
- Enhancements and identification of lake access/view points
- Bluhm Park upgrades
- A community center or downtown park (open space, city center, playgrounds)
- More beaches or enhance Idle Isle beach

The survey requested if respondents believed that current conservation land facilities were sufficient as well. While the highest response agreed (31%), many were neutral (29%) or shared no opinion (16%) indicating many new little about the City's conservation facilities. When asked if people believe the City should continue to pursue acquiring conservation lands, however, the respondent's overwhelming agreed (44%) to accomplish this task. Some opinions for and against acquiring new conservation lands can be found further below.

Lastly, a question was asked in regards to the public's general thoughts on parks, recreation, and conservation in Muskego and what the City should be doing more or less of in regards to parks and conservation. The verbatim responses can be found in Appendix B and the more re-occurring responses are found below.

- Market the lakes, make them visible/usable
- Need dog park
- Manage lands we currently have; don't take off more land on tax rolls
- More public access to lakes
- More land conservation around lakes and waterways
- Save land around Big Muskego Lake
- Set aside as much parks/conservation lands as possible
- Mountain bike trails
- Cross-country ski/ice skate areas
- Add outdoor pool/water park
- Rehabilitate existing areas; higher quality is better than quantity

- Preserve green space
- Need swimming pool
- Conserve as much land as possible
- No charges for residents in Muskego County Park
- Bow range facility needed
- Unknown where conservation facilities are
- ATV/snowmobile areas
- More facilities for teens; teen center
- Have a Community Center
- Limit boating on Little Muskego Lake
- Market parks and conservation area locations
- More parks in District 7

The set of questions began with the following synopsis:

Usage of the City's conservation and parklands is at an all-time high as many residents seek alternative outdoor activities. Please answer the following statements/questions relating to Parks, Recreation, and Conservation.

The questions asked along with their response rates were as followed:

**5.1 Current park facilities and lands are sufficient.**

Responses: Agree 49% (483/983) Neutral 22% (221/983)  
Disagree 18% (180/983) No Opinion 10% (99/983)

Average Response = 3.27

Highest Response = Agree (483 – 49%)

**5.2 There are areas in the City underserved by parks.**

Responses: Agree 15% (144/983) Neutral 31% (304/983)  
Disagree 27% (264/983) No Opinion 28% (271/983)

Average Response = 2.06

Highest Response = No Opinion (271 – 28%) & Disagree (264 – 27%)

**5.2a If so, where and what is needed?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

**5.3 Current conservation land facilities are sufficient.**

Responses: Agree 31% (302/983) Neutral 29% (287/983)  
Disagree 24% (237/983) No Opinion 16% (157/983)

Average Response = 2.71

Highest Response = Agree (302 – 31%)

**5.4 The City should continue to pursue acquiring more conservation lands.**

Responses: Agree 44% (437/983) Neutral 21% (210/983)  
Disagree 20% (198/983) No Opinion 14% (138/983)

Average Response = 3.04

Highest Response = Agree (437 – 44%)

**5.5 Other opinions on parks, recreation, and conservation? What should the City be doing more or less of in regards to the parks and conservation?**

Verbatim responses in Appendix B.

---

## Appendix

### **Other**

Lastly, the survey included a section requesting any other information someone would like the 2020 Planning Committee and elected officials to know during the formulation of the new 2020 Comprehensive Plan. The verbatim responses can be found in Appendix B, however, an assemblage of some of the re-occurring points is found herein:

- Something needs to be done about Parkland mall site
- Do nothing about Parkland Mall site, leave it to private development/owner
- Skateboard park in wrong place
- Control tax base
- Develop and identify downtown (Janesville Road)
- Develop Moorland Road
- Keep rural feel of community
- Encourage slow population growth
- Promote commercial/industrial, not residential growth
- Balance growth
- Preserve lakes
- Promote regional stormwater planning
- More sidewalks on main roads
- Community park would be nice
- Don't amend plans so easily
- Complete bike/path corridors
- No roundabouts
- High end businesses needed
- Restaurants needed
- Re-vamp old landfill along Crowbar Drive – Park/trails, residential housing
- Be weary of water resources
- Beautify industrial park
- Beautify Janesville Road
- Improve Idle Isle beach or add additional more accessible beach to showcase community
- Go smoke free
- Be cognizant of phosphorus fertilizers, ban them
- Ban burning in denser residential areas
- Have walk lights and pedestrian pavement lines at main intersections

## 2a. 2005 Comprehensive Plan Survey

City of Muskego - Comprehensive Plan Survey (Webversion November 2004)							
Please take a few minutes to give us your opinions on how the City of Muskego should best plan for the future. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers and everyone's opinion counts! <b>Your responses will be strictly confidential!</b>							
<b>1. HOUSING</b> Please indicate your agreement with the following statements about Muskego's housing situation.							
	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree Somewhat</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Somewhat</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	
Single-family availability is adequate	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Apartment availability is adequate	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Single-family prices are reasonable	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Apartment rents are reasonable	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Mortgages are difficult to obtain	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Elderly housing availability is adequate	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Affordable single family housing should be a priority of the City	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Currently, the smallest lot size allowed by City Ordinance is 15,000 sq. ft. This permits a minimum 1200 square foot home. Please indicate your agreement with the following statements about minimum lot sizes.							
	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree Somewhat</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Somewhat</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	
Minimum lot sizes should be increased	5	4	3	2	1	0	
The City should allow smaller lot sizes (smaller than 15,000 sq. ft.)	5	4	3	2	1	0	
The City should allow smaller house sizes (smaller than 1200 sq. ft.)	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Since 1990 the City's population has increased from 16,813 to 22,203 in 2004. This is an average increase each year of 385 persons or approximately 2%. Projecting this over the next seven years, by 2010 our population could be 24,500. Please indicate your agreement with the following statements about population growth in Muskego.							
	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree Somewhat</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Somewhat</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	
The City should slow growth below the current rate of increase	5	4	3	2	1	0	
The City should allow population growth to increase to 5% per year	5	4	3	2	1	0	
What is the most important thing the City should do about housing? _____							
<b>2. SCHOOL-EDUCATION</b> Now about education in Muskego. Please indicate your agreement with the following statements about educational opportunities in Muskego.							
	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree Somewhat</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Somewhat</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	
Access to technical schools is acceptable	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Adult educational opportunities are sufficient	5	4	3	2	1	0	
The quality of schools (public or private) is an important reason why I live here	5	4	3	2	1	0	
What is the most important thing that should be done to improve the quality of Muskego schools? _____							
<b>3. GOVERNMENT</b> Please indicate your agreement with the following statements about City of Muskego government.							
	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree Somewhat</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Somewhat</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	
City Hall hours meet my needs	5	4	3	2	1	0	
City Hall should open earlier in the morning	5	4	3	2	1	0	
City Hall should stay open later in the evening	5	4	3	2	1	0	
City Hall should be open Saturday mornings	5	4	3	2	1	0	
City meetings and events are well publicized	5	4	3	2	1	0	
City Hall grounds are accessible to me	5	4	3	2	1	0	
City facilities are not well maintained	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Polling/voting places are accessible to me	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Overall, the quality of City government is good	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Elected officials respond to my needs	5	4	3	2	1	0	
City Staff respond to my needs	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Land use decisions (which uses go where) are logical	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Muskego Police are currently concentrating on the right things	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Muskego Police should concentrate more on traffic control	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Muskego Police should concentrate more on home safety	5	4	3	2	1	0	
What is the most important issue facing Muskego government? _____							
<b>4. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</b> The City of Muskego currently has 4.2% of its land area devoted to commercial activities. Industrial land area currently totals 1.8%. In similar communities (Franklin, New Berlin, Brookfield, Oak Creek), the average land area for commercial use and industrial use is about 2% each. With this information in mind, please indicate your agreement with the following statements about economic development in Muskego.							
	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree Somewhat</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree Somewhat</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	
Muskego needs to work to attract more.....							
Shopping	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Office and professional facilities	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Auto servicing centers	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Industrial development	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Business geared toward youths	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Restaurants	5	4	3	2	1	0	
The City should establish an Economic Development Committee	5	4	3	2	1	0	
What commercial entities would you like to see added to Muskego? _____							

# Appendix

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT Continued.....**

Muskego's Downtown area is on Janesville Road from Bay Lane to Racine Avenue. Please indicate your agreement with these statements about Downtown Muskego.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree Somewhat</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Disagree Somewhat</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Downtown Muskego needs street trees	5	4	3	2	1	0
Downtown Muskego needs decorative street lights	5	4	3	2	1	0
Downtown Muskego needs decorative banners	5	4	3	2	1	0
Downtown Muskego needs more bike/pedestrian paths	5	4	3	2	1	0

What is the most important issue facing downtown Muskego? \_\_\_\_\_

---

**5. UTILITIES** Please indicate your agreement with the following statements about the utility services provided by the City of Muskego.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree Somewhat</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Disagree Somewhat</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Current sewer services are adequate	5	4	3	2	1	0
Current water services are adequate	5	4	3	2	1	0
I would like municipal sewer service	5	4	3	2	1	0
I would like municipal water services	5	4	3	2	1	0

How could the City improve it's public utilities? \_\_\_\_\_

---

**6. TRANSPORTATION** Think for a moment about transportation in Muskego. Please indicate your agreement with the following statements about transportation in Muskego.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree Somewhat</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Disagree Somewhat</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
The City should work to attract a taxi service	5	4	3	2	1	0
Bus service to Waukesha is desirable	5	4	3	2	1	0
Bus service to Milwaukee County is needed	5	4	3	2	1	0
Light rail service to Milwaukee and Waukesha is needed	5	4	3	2	1	0
Janesville Road should be expanded to at least four lanes from Moorland Road to Racine Avenue	5	4	3	2	1	0
Racine Avenue should be expanded to at least four lanes from Janesville Road to I-43	5	4	3	2	1	0
Subdivisions should have interconnecting streets to reduce pedestrian, bike and auto traffic on major roads	5	4	3	2	1	0
More bike and pedestrian paths are needed	5	4	3	2	1	0
If it were available, I would regularly ride a bus to Waukesha	5	4	3	2	1	0
If it were available, I would regularly ride a bus to Milwaukee County	5	4	3	2	1	0

What is the most important transportation problem facing Muskego? \_\_\_\_\_

Is a full Janesville Road expansion viewed as necessary to help Muskego meet it's economic needs? Why or why not? \_\_\_\_\_

---

**7. PARKS AND RECREATION** Please indicate your agreement with these statements about parks and recreation.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree Somewhat</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Disagree Somewhat</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
Current park facilities have sufficient, attractive open spaces	5	4	3	2	1	0
Parks have sufficient recreational facilities for adults	5	4	3	2	1	0
Parks have sufficient recreational facilities for children	5	4	3	2	1	0
More public boat launch sites are needed	5	4	3	2	1	0

What facilities would you like to see added to Muskego's parks? \_\_\_\_\_

---

**8. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES** Please indicate your agreement with the following statements about environmental issues in Muskego.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree Somewhat</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Disagree Somewhat</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
The water quality on Muskego lakes is acceptable	5	4	3	2	1	0
Wetland preservation efforts by the City are adequate	5	4	3	2	1	0
Preservation of wooded areas in Muskego is adequate	5	4	3	2	1	0
Preservation of native plants is necessary	5	4	3	2	1	0
I am willing to allow City dollars to be used to support preservation efforts (water quality, woodlands, wetlands, grasslands)	5	4	3	2	1	0
I am willing to pay higher City taxes to support preservation efforts	5	4	3	2	1	0
The City should maintain the current amount of farmland	5	4	3	2	1	0

How many miles do you live from a working farm? \_\_\_\_\_ miles

A conservation subdivision (COPD) is intended to allow for residential development in clusters in a rural or semi-rural setting. It allows reduced parcel sizes while maintaining the # of lots permitted by the Comprehensive Plan, except bonuses may be granted where the developer implements additional conservation measures. It is further intended to encourage the preservation of high-quality open land as identified in the City's Conservation Plan. Overall, a COPD must provide for 50% of the development as open undeveloped lands. Please indicate your agreement with these statements about COPDs.

I support COPDs whenever proposed	5	4	3	2	1	0
I support the granting of bonus lots to encourage COPDs	5	4	3	2	1	0

What is the most important environmental issue facing Muskego? \_\_\_\_\_

9. **ABOUT YOU** So that the Comprehensive Plan Committee can get a better idea of who is responding to the survey,

<p>How old are you?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Less than 18 years old</li> <li>2. 19 to 29</li> <li>3. 30 to 44</li> <li>4. 45 to 54</li> <li>5. 55 to 64</li> <li>6. 65 to 74</li> <li>7. 75 or older</li> </ol>	<p>How many years have you lived in Muskego?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 2 years or less</li> <li>2. 3 to 5 years</li> <li>3. 6 to 10 years</li> <li>4. 11 to 20 years</li> <li>5. 21 to 30 years</li> <li>6. More than 30 years</li> </ol>	<p>Are you....</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Female</li> <li>2. Male</li> </ol>
<p>What kind of work do you do?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Management/Professional</li> <li>2. Clerical</li> <li>3. Sales or service</li> <li>4. Construction</li> <li>5. Manufacturing</li> <li>6. Skilled</li> <li>7. Farming</li> <li>8. Retired</li> <li>9. Keeping house</li> <li>10. Unemployed</li> </ol>	<p>Where do you work?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In my home</li> <li>2. Muskego</li> <li>3. New Berlin</li> <li>4. Franklin</li> <li>5. Waukesha</li> <li>6. Milwaukee</li> <li>7. Racine</li> <li>8. Brookfield</li> <li>9. Other _____</li> </ol> <p>How many miles do you drive? _____</p>	<p>What is your annual household income?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Less than \$10,000</li> <li>2. \$10,000 to \$19,999</li> <li>3. \$20,000 to \$29,999</li> <li>4. \$30,000 to \$49,999</li> <li>5. \$50,000 to \$69,999</li> <li>6. \$70,000 to \$89,999</li> <li>7. \$90,000 or more</li> </ol>
<p>Do you...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Currently have children in Muskego Schools</li> <li>2. Have children who attended Muskego Schools</li> <li>3. Currently have children in a private/parochial school</li> <li>4. Never had children in Muskego schools</li> </ol>	<p>Do you own or rent your home?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Own</li> <li>2. Rent</li> </ol>	<p>Including yourself, what is your household size? _____ people</p>
<p>Have you visited the City's Internet web site?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes</li> <li>2. No</li> </ol>	<p>Do you read the Muskego Sun?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Always</li> <li>2. Sometimes</li> <li>3. Never</li> </ol>	<p>Have you watched City meetings on television?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes</li> <li>2. No</li> </ol>

Thank you again for your time. Please return your completed survey to:

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
The Fiscal and Economic Research Center  
Department of Economics  
800 W. Main, C4003  
Whitewater, WI 53190

The questionnaire will be kept confidential and the information below is for internal use only. We just need verification of residency. Thank You for your time!

Date filled out: \_\_\_\_\_ Resident Address: \_\_\_\_\_



## 2b. 2005 Comprehensive Plan Survey Executive Summary

The City of Muskego Comprehensive Plan Survey was designed to gather information from property owners in Muskego, Wisconsin to help the City plan for future growth and development in Muskego. The survey questionnaire was designed by the City of Muskego's Planning Department and the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater's Center for Fiscal and Economic Research. The survey was conducted by mail between December, 2004 and February, 2005. Surveys were mailed to a random sample of 1500 property owners in Muskego. Five hundred eleven (511) completed surveys were returned, yielding a response rate of 34%. The major findings of the survey include:

- a. A sense that single family housing was available and prices are reasonable
- b. Confidence in the availability of mortgages
- c. A lack of support for affordable housing
- d. A lack of support for smaller lot sizes and smaller homes
- e. A sense that the rate of growth of the City should slow
- f. Confidence in the quality and access to educational opportunities
- g. Support for the operations of city properties, both recreational and civic
- h. A demand for more restaurants and shopping
- i. A lack of demand for more auto service centers
- j. Interest in an Economic Development Committee
- k. An overall demand for more bike/pedestrian paths
- l. A sense of satisfaction with the current service level on water and sewer
- m. Support for the widening of Janesville Road
- n. Support for more interconnection roads to reduce traffic on major roads
- o. An overall lack of support for mass transit
- p. General support for environmental preservation
- q. Strong opposition to additional taxes to pay for preservation
- r. Support for maintaining the current amount of farmland
- s. Mixed support for the COPD program, with diminishing support for bonus lots

### I. INTRODUCTION

The City of Muskego Comprehensive Plan Survey was designed to gather information from property owners in Muskego, Wisconsin to help the City plan for future growth and development in Muskego. The survey questionnaire was designed by the City of Muskego's Planning Department and the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater's Center for Fiscal and Economic Research. The survey was conducted by mail between December, 2004 and February, 2005. Surveys were mailed to a random sample of 1500 property owners in Muskego. Five Hundred Eleven (511) completed surveys were returned, yielding a response rate of 34% (see Appendix A, Technical Report).

Significant demographic and geographic differences are noted in the report. Detailed tabular results can be found in Appendix D and results to open-ended questions are included in Appendix C.

### II HOUSING

Respondents to the City of Muskego Comprehensive Plan Survey were first asked to rate the level of agreement with several statements about housing in Muskego on a scale of one to five, where one means "strongly disagree" and five means "strongly agree". In addition, respondents were provided the opportunity to answer "no opinion".

In general, Muskego property owners believe that the housing situation in Muskego is satisfactory—homes and apartment are available, mortgages are easy to obtain and elderly housing is believed to be adequate (see Table 2.1). However, there is growing concern regarding the affordability of housing. Note that the Likert scale answers are reversed in the instance of "Mortgages are difficult to obtain". This is to discourage the tendency to "anchor"

## Appendix

answers in a pattern (all answers should be “agree”, for example) based on the previous answers. In addition, percents do not include those respondents who provided no opinion to the question, see Appendix D for Detailed Tabular Results for all possible answers.

Table 2.1  
Housing in Muskego  
(1= “strongly disagree”; 5= “strongly agree”)

	Percent “Strongly Agree”	Percent “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”	Mean Score	(N)
<b>Housing</b>				
Single family availability is adequate	54.0%	6.7%	4.3	478
Apartment availability is adequate	53.2	3.7	4.3	423
Single family prices are reasonable	17.3	25.8	3.4	474
Apartment rents are reasonable	22.9	12.1	3.5	297
Mortgages are difficult to obtain	1.9	73.0	1.9	415
Elderly housing availability is adequate	28.9	18.7	3.6	384
Affordable single family housing should be a priority of the City	17.7	43.9	2.8	480

Returning to the issue of housing affordability, it is interesting to review the results of the 1998 Comprehensive Planning Survey in relation to the 2005 Survey.

	“Strongly Agree”	“Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”	Mean Score
Single family (home) prices are reasonable (1998)	20.7	14.9	3.7
Single family (home) prices are reasonable (2005)	17.3	25.8	3.4

This could indicate some concern over the affordability of homes in the community. However, when compared to the results regarding “affordable housing”, the change in answers provides a dichotomous result.

	“Strongly Agree”	“Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”	Mean Score
Affordable single family housing should be a priority of the City (1998)	19.9	37.1	3.1
Affordable single family housing should be a priority of the City (2005)	17.7	43.9	2.8

This indicates that there has been a decline in the support for affordable housing within the community. At the same time, the earlier question indicated increasing concern over reasonable home prices. One explanation may be the changing demographics within the community. This issue will be confronted later in the report.

### Lot & Home Sizes

Muskego property owners were next asked to respond to three statements about lot sizes and house sizes. Muskego property owners do not want the City to allow smaller houses or lots. Eighty-one percent of Muskego property owners disagree or strongly disagree that the City should allow lot sizes smaller than 15,000 square feet. Similarly, 75 percent disagree or strongly disagree that the City should allow houses smaller than 1,200 square feet.

Rather than reducing lot or house size, a plurality of Muskego property owners (55.6%) believe that minimum lot sizes should be increased. (Table 2.2). These results are consistent with the 1998 survey.

Table 2.2  
Lot and House Sizes  
(1= “strongly disagree”; 5= “strongly agree”)

	Percent “Strongly Agree”	Percent “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”	Mean Score	(N)
<b>Lot and House Sizes</b>				
Minimum lot sizes should be increased	33.9%	30.1%	4.3	492
The City should allow smaller lot sizes Smaller than 15,000 sq ft	4.5	81.2	1.7	494
The City should allow smaller House sizes Smaller than 1,200 sq ft	7.3	74.8	1.9	493

**Population Growth**

Muskego property owners were also asked two question regarding population growth in the community and strongly in favor of limiting growth (Table 2.3) Over half (57.5%) of Muskego property owners agree that “the City should slow population growth below the current rate of increase”. When asked a similar question on population increase, 75.4 percent of Muskego property owners wither disagree or strongly disagree that “the City should allow population growth to increase to 5% per year”.

Table 2.3  
Population Growth  
(1= “strongly disagree”; 5=“strongly agree”)

	Percent “Strongly Agree”	Percent “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”	Mean Score	(N)
<b>Population Growth</b>				
The City should slow growth below the The current rate of increase.	38.3%	25.4%	3.6	496
The City should allow population growth To increase to 5% per year.	4.6	75.4	1.9	480

**III EDUCATION**

Muskego property owners were asked to agree or disagree with three statements about schools and education in Muskego. In general, property agree somewhat that quality schools are an important reason for their living in Muskego, that access to technical schools is acceptable, and that adult educational opportunities are sufficient (Table 3.1). These results are consistent with the 1998 survey.

Table 3.1  
Education  
(1= “strongly disagree”; 5=“strongly agree”)

	Percent “Strongly Agree”	Percent “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”	Mean Score	(N)
<b>Education</b>				
The quality of schools (private or public) Is an important reason I live here	23.2%	19.5%	3.5	435
Access to technical schools is acceptable	19.6	24.5	3.4	449
Adult education opportunities are sufficient	24.4	23.7	3.4	443

**IV GOVERNMENT**

**City Facilities**

City property owners were next asked a series of questions about Muskego’s City government, including several questions concerning access to City facilities. Muskego property owners are generally satisfied with the

## Appendix

accessibility of City Hall, but there is moderate support for keeping City Hall open later in the evening and on Saturdays (Table 4.1). These results are consistent with the 1998 survey.

Table 4.1  
Government Facilities  
(1= "strongly disagree"; 5="strongly agree")

	Percent "Strongly Agree"	Percent "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree"	Mean Score	(N)
<b>Government</b>				
City hall hours meet my needs	31.6%	9.7%	3.9	478
City hall should open earlier in the morning	5.1	24.8	2.9	450
City hall should stay open later in the evening	12.0	20.0	3.2	457
City hall should be open Saturday morning	16.7	29.6	3.4	466
City meetings are well publicized	13.3	24.9	3.3	481
City hall grounds are accessible to me	45.7	2.2	4.3	490
City facilities are not well maintained	6.7	61.6	2.3	481
Polling/voting places are accessible to me	53.7	5.4	4.3	492
Overall, the quality of City government is good	13.0	21.3	3.4	485
Elected officials respond to my needs	5.9	26.8	3.0	440
City Staff respond to my needs	14.2	15.2	3.5	459
Land use decisions are logical	3.2	45.2	2.6	464
Muskego Police are currently concentrating on the right things	12.1	22.1	3.3	471
Muskego Police should concentrate more on Traffic Control	7.1	37.5	2.8	479
Muskego Police are currently concentrating on the Home Safety	19.2	10.2	3.5	480

## V ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

### Office, Retail and Services

A number of questions were asked on the Comprehensive Planning survey concerning economic development in Muskego. First, six questions were asked regarding the types of businesses that property owners want to see in Muskego. Shopping, office and professional facilities and restaurants are the types of businesses most desired by Muskego property owners. Businesses geared toward youth are moderately desired, while industrial development and auto service centers are the least desirable businesses. (Table 5.1)

Table 5.1  
Muskego Needs to Attract More...  
(1= "strongly disagree"; 5="strongly agree")

	Percent "Strongly Agree"	Percent "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree"	Mean Score	(N)
Muskego needs to attract more...				
Shopping	37.4%	22.4%	3.7	494
Office and professional facilities	29.6%	19.6	3.6	490
Auto service centers	4.3	47.2	2.5	488
Industrial development	24.4%	35.6	3.2	491
Businesses geared toward youth	12.7%	26.2	3.2	488
Restaurants	34.1%	14.4	3.8	495
The City should establish an Economic	28.5%	19.6	3.6	470

Development Committee

Not surprisingly, as a result of development around the Moorland Road corridor, the support for more shopping has diminished since the 1998 survey. However, support for restaurants (21% strongly agree and 23% strongly disagree in 1998) and Office and Professional facilities (26% strongly agree and 22% strongly disagree in 1998) has grown dramatically. As noted in the 1998 report, property owners with high levels of income are more likely to agree that Muskego needs more restaurants. This change in public opinion may reflect the demographic changes in Muskego’s income.

The question regarding the creation of an economic development committee is a modification of 1998’s question regarding the creation of an economic development office. In light of the lukewarm support given to a City office (a mean score of 3.1 and a level of strongly agree of 16%), the question was modified to refer to a citizen’s committee. Given this modification, support grew to 28.5% strongly agree and a mean score of 3.6%.

Downtown Improvements

Survey participants were asked to rate four proposed improvements to Muskego’s Downtown area. While none of the proposed improvements are strongly desired by Muskego property owners, more bike/pedestrian paths and street trees are favored by a majority of Muskego property owners. While only 28.3% of Muskego property owners agree that Downtown Muskego needs decorative banners, 51.8% agree that Downtown Muskego needs decorative street lights. Support for trees (59.8% strongly agreed or somewhat agreed) and bike/pedestrian paths (59.8% strongly agreed or somewhat agreed) was strong.

Table 5.2  
Downtown Muskego Needs...  
(1= “strongly disagree”; 5= “strongly agree”)

Muskego needs...	Percent “Strongly Agree”	Percent “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”	Mean Score	(N)
Street Trees	32.5	23.2%	3.6	495
Decorative street lights	25.6	29.2	3.3	497
Decorative banners	12.9	45.9	2.7	495
More bike/pedestrian paths	34.1	23.4	3.6	499

**VI UTILITIES**

Four questions were asked regarding water and sewer services currently provided by the City of Muskego. First, survey respondents were asked if sewer and water services were adequate. Seventy Seven percent of Muskego property owners agree that current sewer services are adequate while 60.1 percent agree that current water services are adequate (Table 6.1). There is not a great demand among Muskego property owners for water or sewer services—only 24.7% agree that they would like municipal sewer service and 26.3% agree that they would like municipal water services. The lack of participation on these questions reflects the extensive water and sewer coverage already existing in Muskego.

Table 6.1  
Utility Services  
(1= “strongly disagree”; 5= “strongly agree”)

Utility Services	Percent “Strongly Agree”	Percent “Disagree” or “Strongly Disagree”	Mean Score	(N)
Current sewer services are adequate	33.5	5.6%	4.0	468
Current water services are adequate	24.5	16.0	3.6	421
I would like municipal sewer service	13.6	21.7	3.0	332
I would like municipal water service	14.4	42.8	2.7	402

## Appendix

### VII TRANSPORTATION

A series of questions were asked to Muskego property owners about various transportation issues and proposals. The proposal which received the highest level of support is the construction of more bike and pedestrian paths. Almost 60% of Muskego property owners agree with this proposal (Table 7.1). There are varying degrees of support for street issues. First, of the questions asked, the idea of widening Janesville Road found the greatest support. While the idea of interconnecting street found a support by a majority of respondents, the widening of Racine Avenue was not supported by a majority.

Property owners are consistent in their view of the appropriateness and interest in mass transportation. From Taxi service, to light rail, to bus service, these programs see little support and little interest.

Table 7.1  
Transportation  
(1= "strongly disagree"; 5="strongly agree")

	Percent "Strongly Agree"	Percent "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree"	Mean Score	(N)
Transportation				
The City should work to attract a taxi service	6.7%	49.1%	2.5	481
Bus service to Waukesha is desirable	8.2	41.5%	2.7	465
Bus service to Milw. County is needed	12.3	40.6%	2.8	470
Light rail service to Milw. and Waukesha is needed	8.7	54.9%	2.1	481
Janesville Road should be expanded to at least four lanes from Moreland Road to Racine Avenue	31.4	31.0	3.4	503
Racine Avenue should be expanded to at least four lanes from Janesville Road to I-43	23.7	37.2	3.1	497
Subdivisions should have interconnecting Street to reduce pedestrian, bike, and auto traffic on major roads	22.4	24.5	3.4	490
More bike and pedestrian paths are needed	27.3	21.9	3.5	494
If it were available, I would regularly ride a bus to Waukesha	3.2	76.6	1.7	470
If it were available, I would regularly ride a bus to Milwaukee County	5.0	69.2	1.9	481

### VIII PARKS AND RECREATION

Four questions were asked regarding the park and recreational facilities currently available in Muskego. Muskego property owners believe that current park facilities have sufficient attractive open spaces, have sufficient recreational facilities for children and adults (Table 8.1). Most property owners do not agree that more public boat launch sites are needed.

Table 8.1  
Parks and Recreation  
(1= "strongly disagree"; 5="strongly agree")

	Percent "Strongly Agree"	Percent "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree"	Mean Score	(N)
Parks and Recreation				
Current park facilities have sufficient, attractive open spaces	28.9	11.3%	3.9	492

Parks have sufficient recreational facilities for adults	21.8	17.5	3.6	487
Parks have sufficient recreational facilities for children	25.5	14.5	3.7	478
More public boat launch sites are needed	12.7	40.7	2.8	449

## IX ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

In order to understand how Muskego property owners feel about the City's role in protecting the environment, several statements were directed toward specific environmental issues. Muskego property owners are less than satisfied with the City's efforts to protect the environment. Only 46.2% of Muskego property owners agree (either strongly or somewhat) that wetland preservation efforts by the City are adequate, 39.1 percent agree that current water quality on Muskego lakes is acceptable, and 43.5 percent agree that preservation of wooded areas in Muskego is adequate (Table 9.1). Further evidence of Muskego property owner's concern over environmental issues is that 56.7% agree that preservation of native plants is necessary.

Table 9.1  
Environmental Issues  
(1= "strongly disagree"; 5="strongly agree")

	Percent "Strongly Agree"	Percent "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree"	Mean Score	(N)
Environmental Issues				
The water quality on Muskego lakes is acceptable	8.5	35.7%	3.0	435
Wetland preservation efforts by the City Are adequate	13.3	29.6	3.2	450
Preservation of wooded areas in Muskego Is adequate	11.6	39.2	2.4	464
Preservation of native plants is necessary	25.1	17.5	3.6	474

Property owners were then asked several question about using City monies for environmental preservation efforts and if they would be willing to pay higher taxes to pay for those farmland efforts (Table 9.2). While holding a mixed opinion of the appropriation of tax dollars to support preservation efforts (57.6% in favor while 26.1% opposed), property owners are squarely opposed to higher taxes for this purpose (37% in favor while 46.0% opposed). The survey respondents are clearer in their support for the ideal of farmland preservation with 64.0% in favor with only 15.2% opposed.

Table 9.2  
Environmental Issues  
(1= "strongly disagree"; 5="strongly agree")

	Percent "Strongly Agree"	Percent "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree"	Mean Score	(N)
Environmental Preservation				
I am willing to allow City dollars to be used To support preservation efforts (water quality, woodlands, wetlands, grasslands)	19.8	26.1%	3.4	490
I am willing to pay higher taxes to support preservation efforts	13.9	47.0	2.7	489
The City should maintain the current amount of farmland	41.5	15.2	3.8	427

A final question regarding development and environmental issues was posed regarding an evolving type of development, the conservation subdivision. This question squarely confronted the idea of the COPD and the idea of

---

## Appendix

awarding bonus lots to developers as an incentive to participate. The concept of a COPD appears to have support (49.8% in favor while 23.6% opposed). However, support for bonus lots erodes with only 40.6% in favor with 32.3% opposed.

Table 9.3  
Conservation Subdivisions  
(1= "strongly disagree"; 5="strongly agree")

	Percent "Strongly Agree"	Percent "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree"	Mean Score	(N)
Conservation Subdivisions				
I support COPD's whenever proposed	19.5	23.6%	3.3	435
I support the granting of bonus lots to Encourage COPD's	15.3	32.3	3.0	431

## 3. Real or Perceived Contaminated Site Table from Chapter 6

Table 6.6 Real or Perceived Contaminated Sites

Activity Type	Activity Name	Address	Start Date
SPILL	HWY 24 @ LANNON RD [HISTORIC SPILL]	HWY 24 AT LANNON RD	2/17/1978
ERP	HILLTOP RESTORATION #2506	19501 W TANS RD	1/1/1980
ERP	PARKLAND DEVELOPMENT #3120 - FUTURE	W124 S10391 124TH ST	1/1/1980
SPILL	S67 W17927 PEARL DR [HISTORIC SPILL]	S67 W17927 PEARL DR	7/15/1981
SPILL	S76 W18109 JANESVILLE RD [HISTORIC SPILL]	S76 W18109 JANESVILLE RD	4/4/1986
SPILL	W139 S6755 SHERWOOD CT [HISTORIC SPILL]	W139 S6755 SHERWOOD CT	4/4/1988
ERP	NIKE SITE- FORMER	ADRIAN DR	8/30/1988
SPILL	700-800' N OF HWY 24 & LANNON DR [HISTORIC]	700-800' N OF HWY 24 & LANNON	10/5/1988
LUST	CLARK STATION #1560	S73 W16680 JANESVILLE RD	2/22/1989
SPILL	W187 S6938 GOLD D [HISTORIC SPILL]	W187 S6938 GOLD D	3/25/1989
SPILL	DRAINAGE DITCH BEHIND W124 S10227 124TH	W124 S10227 124TH	5/7/1989
LUST	MILL VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	HILLENDALE RD	6/22/1989
LUST	NATIONAL SCHOOL BUS (TESS CORNERS)	W146 S6365 TESS CORNERS RD	8/14/1989
LUST	BENCO OIL	W187 S7825 LIONS PARK RD	1/3/1990
LUST	KELLY DOOR SYSTEMS	W183 S8253 RACINE AVE	7/23/1990
LUST	HAMM LLOYD S INC	S80 W18753 APOLLO DR	9/21/1990
LUST	PAHLE PROPERTY	S80 W18906 JANESVILLE RD	10/8/1990
LUST	TESS CORNERS SCHOOL	W147 S6800 DURHAM DR	10/29/1990
LUST	KERR-MCGEE- SMITH/OLD LOOMIS PUMP	S107 W16311 LOOMIS RD	12/18/1990
LUST	VALLEY SAND & GRAVEL	S63 W19750 LUCKOW DR	2/27/1991
LUST	WAUKESHA CNTY - MUSKEGO CNTY PARK	S83 W20370 JANESVILLE RD	3/6/1991
LUST	EGG PRODUCTS INC	S66 W14328 JANESVILLE RD	1/15/1992
LUST	B F I	W143 S6400 COLLEGE CT	1/16/1992
LUST	BFI	W144 S6350 COLLEGE CT	1/16/1992
LUST	YOUNGS AUTO BODY	S76 W17833 JANESVILLE RD	1/31/1992

## Appendix

LUST	JOHNNYS PETROLEUM PRODUCTS INC	S76 W17871 JANESVILLE RD	6/2/1992
LUST	MUSKEGO HIGH SCHOOL	W183 S8750 RACINE AVE	9/28/1992
LUST	ALLENS SALES & SERVICE	13300 W JANESVILLE RD	11/12/1992
LUST	SNOW LEASING	W145 S6550 TESS CORNERS DR	12/30/1992
ERP	WHITEHOUSE PROPERTY	W219 S7436 CROWBAR DR	4/20/1993
ERP	DELTA CORP	W188 S8393 MERCURY DR	5/19/1993
LUST	RICCO SUE PROPERTY	W125 S7617 COVENTRY LN	7/15/1993
LUST	REYNOLDS MACHINE CO	17626 W MARTIN DR	10/11/1993
SPILL	W188 S8393 MERCURY DR [HISTORIC SPILL]	W188 S8393 MERCURY DR	10/31/1993
ERP	MUSKEGO CTY PW GARAGE	W189 S8235 MERCURY DR	12/23/1993
LUST	MUSKEGO SAN LF	MUSKEGO	1/17/1994
LUST	MUSKEGO SAN LF	MUSKEGO	1/17/1994
SPILL	583 W18380 SATURN DR [HISTORIC SPILL]	S83 W18380 SATURN DR	2/12/1994
LUST	MUSKEGO PARKS GARAGE (GAS & DIESEL)	W180 S7732 PIONEER DR	6/6/1994
LUST	RAYS GARAGE (FORMER)	S66 W14427 JANESVILLE RD	6/14/1994
SPILL	14444 JANESVILLE RD [HISTORIC SPILL]	14444 W JANESVILLE RD	10/27/1994
LUST	MUSKEGO VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPT	W195 S10030 RACINE AVE	11/30/1994
LUST	WI DOT ECKSTEIN	S98 W12970 LOOMIS RD	1/6/1995
LUST	VALLEY SAND & GRAVEL - SITE #2	S63 W19750 LUCKOW DR	10/17/1995
SPILL	MICHAELS JAY PROPERTY [HISTORIC SPILL]	COLLEGE AVE	3/4/1996
SPILL	NATURESCAPE - MUSKEGO	W12601 W JANESVILLE RD	3/18/1996
ERP	NATURESCAPE	W12601 JANESVILLE RD	6/13/1996
LUST	OPEN PANTRY FOOD MART	S66 W14501 JANESVILLE RD	7/29/1996
ERP	PARKSIDE NURSERY - MUSKEGO	S69W14105 TESS CORNERS DR	3/6/1997
SPILL	DURHAM & HOLZ	DURHAM & HOLZ	5/1/1997
LUST	HOPSON OIL CO BIG BEND	S84 W21172 JANESVILLE RD	5/22/1997
LUST	ACHTENHAGEN RESIDENCE	W144 S7911 DURHAM DR	9/24/1997
LUST	MUSKEGO MOBIL	S75 W17237 JANESVILLE RD	10/8/1997
ERP	MERIT ASPHALT INC	S84 W18645 ENTERPRISE DR	10/23/1997
LUST	MUSKEGO CTY POLICE DEPT	W183 S8150 RACINE AVE	3/20/1998
LUST	CHOIR PRACTICE BAR	S66 W14580 JANESVILLE RD	4/10/1998

LUST	VALLEY SAND & GRAVEL	S63 W19750 LUCKOW DR	7/23/1998
SPILL	LITTLE MUSKEGO LAKE	PUBLIC LAUNCH--PLEASANT VIEW D	9/21/1998
LUST	ERDMANN MOTORS	S98 W12578 LOOMIS RD	10/20/1998
LUST	MANNIGAN ETHEL PROPERTY	12785 W JANESVILLE RD	10/30/1998
SPILL	W1465 6420 TESS CORNERS	W1465 6420 TESS CORNERS	11/4/1998
LUST	LIDLAW TRANSIT INC	W146 S6365 TESS CORNERS RD	1/5/1999
LUST	MUSKEGO CTY PW GARAGE	W189 S8235 MERCURY DR	3/16/1999
LUST	MUSKEGO MOBIL - WASTE OIL LUST	S75 W17237 JANESVILLE RD	3/29/1999
SPILL	MERCURY DR & ENTERPRIZE	MERCURY DR & ENTERPRISE	10/18/1999
SPILL	TNT ASPHALT	NE OF JANESVILLE RD & MERCURY	11/18/1999
LUST	SALENTINE BUICK-PONTIAC	S66 W14444 JANESVILLE RD	3/8/2000
LUST	NIEMAN FARM PROPERTY	S87 W19091 WOODS RD	6/23/2000
LUST	SS EXPRESS LN	S75 W 17226 JANESVILLE RD	11/30/2001
SPILL	GLOCKNER AUTO SALVAGE	S71 W13219 TESS CORNERS DR	5/29/2002
ERP	W M W I - MUSKEGO	MUSKEGO	9/30/2002
SPILL	SUBURBAN ASPHALT	S98 W12878 LOOMIS DR	10/29/2002
LUST	ENGEL ELEANOR ESTATE	S92 W19656 HENNEBERRY DR	11/13/2002
LUST	PRESTIGE AUTO RESTORATION	S66 W14543 JANESVILLE RD	12/16/2002
ERP	MUSKEGO THEATER - FORMER	S67 W19491 TANS DR	1/15/2003
SPILL	WIS COIL SPRING INC	S82 W19151 APOLLO DR	5/28/2003
SPILL	LORRAINE BABE	W175 S7026 HIAWATHA DR	5/28/2003
SPILL	RAWSON CONST	15350 WOODS RD	8/8/2003
LUST	TERRA - FIRMA (SCHUSTER PROPERTY)	S66 W14427 JANESVILLE RD	8/18/2003
ERP	ENGEL ELEANOR ESTATE	S92 W19656 HENNEBERRY DR	8/25/2003
ERP	ROW BY SALENTINE BUICK	S66 W14444 JANESVILLE RD	9/26/2003
ERP	GLOCKNER JACK PROPERTY	S71 W13219 TESS CORNERS DR	11/21/2003
SPILL	WE ENERGY	DURAN DR & DARTMOUTH CIR	2/15/2004
ERP	KWIK TRIP #664 - SURFACE SPILL	S79 W18884 JANESVILLE RD	8/17/2004
ERP	CARITY LAND CORP	1/8 MI SW OF INTERS MORELAND	9/14/2004
SPILL	BIOSOURCE	S67 W14543 JANESVILLE RD	9/15/2004
LUST	COUNTY R-O-W AT S66 W14501 JANESVILLE RD.	S66 W14501 JANESVILLE RD	11/19/2004

---

## Appendix

ERP	RAYS GARAGE (FORMER)	S66 W14427 JANESVILLE RD	3/7/2005
	KWIK TRIP STORE #664 - UST SYSTEM		
LUST	RELEASE	S79 W18884 JANESVILLE RD	4/21/2005
ERP	JILL'S DRY CLEANERS	S74 W16834 JANESVILLE RD	4/25/2005
	SCHAUMBERG SITE		
LUST	FORMER	IN R-O-W AT S66 W14512	5/3/2005
SPILL	MUSKEGO MOBIL	S73 W16680 JANESVILLE RD	12/14/2005
	GERALD AND MARY ANN SMITH TRUST		
LUST	PROPERTY	S66 W14584 JANESVILLE RD	4/18/2006





**Adopted:**  
**Common Council: April 14, 2009**  
**Planning Commission: April 7, 2009**  
**2020 Comp Plan Committee: March 3, 2009**